

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/668,547	PODSIADLO, EUGENE LAWRENCE	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Thu Thao Havan	3624	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Thu Thao Havan. (3) Steven Pokotilow.  
 (2) Eugene Podsiadlo. (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 23 September 2005.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
 c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☒ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
 If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 2.

Identification of prior art discussed: Van Horn (US 6,631,356).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed prior art in relation the claimed limitations. In particular the limitation of "hurdle rate".

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

VINCENT MILLIN  
 SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
 TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600



Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an  
 Attachment to a signed Office action.

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Examiner's signature, if required